

REMARKS

J.K. TO ENTER

11/6/06

Amendments

Claims 30, 31, 34, and 35 have been indicated as being allowable, and therefore, have been rewritten in independent form incorporating the subject matter of claims 14, 15, 14, and 15, respectively. Original independent claims 14 and 15 have been canceled. The claim dependencies of claims 24 to 29, 40, and 41 have been amended as a result. Claims 16 to 19, 22, 23, 38, and 39 have been canceled. New dependent claims 42 to 49 have been added. Basis for these new claims is found in claims 24 to 29, 40, and 41.

These amendments have been amended solely to more clearly define and recite the present invention. The amendments are not in any way related to the Examiner's rejection based on prior art or any applied or cited prior art. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute claims of similar or different scope to the canceled claims in one or more continuation applications.

The Rejection Under 35 USC § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 14, 15, 22-29 and 38-41 under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Japanese Publication No. 59-121764 A in view of Klein (U.S. Patent No. 4,456,784) and de Vrieze et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,089,329), insofar as the rejection is applicable to the amended claims. Applicants believe that these rejections have been rendered moot in view of the cancellation of claims 14, 15, 22, 23, 38, and 39, and the amendments to claims 24-29, 40 and 41 to be dependent on an allowable independent claim.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 16-19, 22-29, and 38-39 under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Japanese Publication No. 59-121764 A in view of Klein (U.S. Patent No. 4,456,784) and de Vrieze et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,089,329) and further in view of Chang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,979,902), insofar as the rejection is applicable to the amended claims. (Applicants assume the reference to "the references set forth in numbered paragraph 8" in line 2 of paragraph 4, was intended to refer to paragraph 3.) Applicants believe that these rejections have been rendered moot in view of the cancellation of claims 16-19, 22, 23, 38, and 39, and the amendments to claims 24-29 to be dependent on an allowable independent claim.